INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

RST Foundation

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Unsatisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Below/Approaching Standard (1.5)	Criminal Background Checks	Non-Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Unsatisfactory	Instruction is clear	Approaching Standard (2)	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Unsatisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Approaching Standard (2)	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Below/Approaching Standard (1.5)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 8:1 or less	Meeting Standard (3)		

ACTION NEEDED:

RST is been placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the onsite monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report. As such, RST has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: RST Foundation   **DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 02/26/08**
REVIEWER: MC

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	**BOTH** of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (all tutors) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Tutor evaluations (all tutors) -Recruiting policy for tutors (one copy) -Sample tutor contract (one copy)	• Tutor applications • Professional development description • Professional development agendas and content information • Staff attendance log • Staff recruitment flyers • Employment contract	X		• Most tutors have at least 60 hours of college credit. However, one tutor does not meet RST's minimum qualifications. Corrective action is required. • Consistency is needed in terminology used for tutors, tutor assistants, and lead tutors. As per RST's response, literature will be revised to refer only to Lead Tutors and Tutors. • A written description states that four professional development sessions are provided; two prior to tutoring beginning and two while tutoring is going on. • Agendas for each professional development session were provided. It seems that it would be helpful to staff if instead of waiting until the third or fourth professional development session to talk about tutoring activities, tutors were familiarized with the RST program (program curriculum, how to utilize student ILPs, and how to implement the RST program) upfront. • Staff time logs were submitted; staff participated in professional development after scheduled tutoring sessions. In the future, separate sign-in sheets will be used for professional development.
	TWO of the following:	• Advertising	X		• The recruitment flyer submitted states,

| Recruiting materials | -Advertising or recruitment fliers
-Incentives policy
-Program description for parents | flyers
• Program descriptions | | | "interested in having your child receive individual instruction?" This statement is inconsistent both with RST's approved student/tutor ratio and with tutoring observed. In sessions observed, students did not generally receive individual instruction and instead worked primarily independently or in large groups. RST's approved ratio is for large group tutoring in groups of 6:8-1. It is misleading to tell parents on recruitment flyers that students will receive "individual instruction", which insinuates that tutoring is 1:1.
• The second flyer submitted includes incorrect information that is not consistent with RST's approved amendment. The flyer refers to computer-based instruction, which RST does not provide, as well as "highly trained teachers and teaching assistants". RST's tutor qualifications meet state minimums and do not include requirements that tutors are certified teachers; moreover, four professional development sessions does not likely qualify the tutors to be described as "highly trained."
• A third informational flyer describes RST tutors as "licensed/highly qualified." Not all staff are licensed (in fact, few are), nor are they "highly qualified" according to the term as it is used in No Child Left Behind. Because this term has a very specific connotation, RST should avoid using it unless all tutors are certified and/or highly qualified under NCLB.
• Flyers promise student activities, project-enhanced and project-based activities, and some promote one to one instruction. Student activities and project-based activities were not observed at tutoring sites. In addition, RST is not a one-to-one provider and should avoid marketing itself as one, or should clarify that one-to- |

					one instruction is only a component of the programming which may or may not occur every session.
					• Flyers promote weekly progress reports; however, RST's progress reporting timeline, as well as its application, demonstrate that progress reporting is done only bi-weekly, not weekly.
					• A revised, approved program flyer was submitted to address the issues noted above.
Academic Program	**ONE** of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	• Lesson description • Sample lesson plan • Standards covered on lessons	X		• The tutoring schedule submitted and the class time management schedule indicates that students who are not being provided direct instruction should work on "individual projects or homework" for 45 minutes. 45 minutes is too long to be spent working on homework. Generally, students should not spend more than about 10-15 minutes working on homework, and during that time, they should have tutor interaction. In addition, working on worksheets with little to no tutor interaction does not qualify as "individual projects". The approved amendment notes that during that time, students should be getting "project-based instruction or one-to-one instruction", which is very different from "individual projects" that only involve students working on worksheets with little tutor interaction or homework. • RST's approved amendment describes project-based activities and direct instruction utilizing a variety of instructional strategies. The class time management schedule submitted is not reflective of RST's approved and amended application, nor was observed tutoring reflective of the approved amendment. RST's approved application notes that students will spend 55 minutes with a teacher in small group instruction and 55 minutes engaging in project-based

4

					instruction and/or one-on-one instruction. RST was not approved to allow students to spend 45 minutes working on homework or "individual projects" which, according to the tutoring observed, were generally students working on worksheets with little to no tutor interaction.
					• Lesson description provided describes COACH workbooks and notes that Saxon Math and SRA reading "may be used as a resource as needed." RST's application and subsequent amendment does not mention the use of COACH workbooks. RST's documentation of research to support the program, as well as documentation of instructional strategies from both the application and the amendment refer to research on A+, Saxon Math and SRA Reading—and do not mention COACH workbooks. RST may not utilize curricular materials that were not approved in its application or subsequent amendments.
					• Lesson plan submitted describes use of COACH workbooks and instructional activities. As noted above, RST is not approved to use COACH workbooks and is supposed to be utilizing Saxon Math and SRA Reading along with project-based activities. Moreover, instructional activities as described in the lesson plan were not observed in most lessons, nor were any project-based activities.
					• Worksheets/lesson plans from the Indiana Standards & Resources pages submitted provide standards covered in the lessons. However, as noted above, instructional activities described in the lesson plans were not observed in most lessons.
					• Corrective action will be implemented to address the concerns listed in this section.
	ALL of the following:	• SES contract for MSD Lawrence Twp.	**X**		• Feedback from two districts indicates that progress reports have been sent to the district in a timely manner.

| Progress Reporting | -Progress reports
(see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)
-Timeline for sending progress reports
-Documentation of reports sent | • SES contract for MSD Pike Twp.
• SES contract for Gary Com. Schools
• Sample progress reports
• SES agreements for MSD Lawrence Twp., MSD Pike Twp.
• Timeline for sending reports
• Documentation of reports sent | | | • Progress reports include number of lessons completed in each subject, and percent mastery of the lessons. They also include a line for parent and student signatures and information about student behavior. Some progress reports included information about assessments and had a line for the tutor signature, while others did not.
• On the SES agreement, RST has checked that they offer "one-to-one tutoring" as well as "online services". However, this is inaccurate because RST offers group instruction.
• Progress reports do not appear to be filled out in a consistent manner across tutors. For example, the progress reports submitted for Lawrence Township and Gary noted generally "two lessons, 80% mastery" for each subject, while progress reports submitted for Pike Township listed actual lessons covered within those subjects. However, information given in the Pike Township progress reports was also inconsistent across the reports. In addition, some areas of progress reports are unlikely to be clear for parents or districts. Finally, listing lessons covered by name such as "I know that word" may be unclear to parents/schools. Parents/schools would not necessarily know what "I know that word" means or what is covered in that lesson. It would be better to list the standard or concept covered.
• Progress reports from Gary had the lesson listed in the top section of the progress reports, while Pike progress reports did not; Lawrence progress reports had assessment information in that section instead of lessons or assignments. Progress reports must be filled out consistently across districts and tutors.
• Progress reports should include more |

						information about what is contained in the lessons—i.e., "completed 2 lessons" doesn't tell the parent what the child worked on in those lessons, how that connects to the child's individually determined goals, or which standards were covered In addition, "Math" is a broad area therefore a sentence stating, "two lessons in Math" is very general and may be vague to a parent.
						• One set of progress reports (for MSD Lawrence) includes information about A+ Learning Systems assignments. Since RST is not using A+ Learning Systems as its curriculum, the progress report should not have a table on it for lessons and assignments through A+. Additionally, progress reports submitted for 10/23 – 11/01 are different in layout from progress reports submitted for 11/06 – 11/15. Progress reports should be consistent across reporting periods.
						• Progress reports submitted for the students in MSD Lawrence Township demonstrate that the students are working on standards/subjects that were not listed in the SES agreement. Students should not be working on subjects that were not denoted in the SES agreement.
						• SES agreement submitted for Gary Com. Schools had no areas of instruction checked. Areas of instruction must be checked.

						• As per USDE and IDOE guidance detailed in the checklist sent to providers in December of 2007, progress reports need to include the following information:
						   • Student goals from the SES agreement
						   • Tutor's name
						   • Pre-assessment scores
						   • Name of the student's school
						   • Update on progress made toward

					student goals • A written statement that recommendations regarding how the progress report can be improved can be made by calling or emailing provider • Progress reports must be revised and will be reviewed periodically. Corrective action will be implemented to address the concerns noted in this section.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	**ALL** of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	• Student goal sheet • Description of individual learning plan development • Pre-assessment scores • Description of correlation of assessment to academic standards		X	• Assessments utilized are Saxon Math/SRA Reading. Although these were described as ongoing assessments in the application and A+ computer-based assessments were to be used, technology issues prohibited the use of A+ assessments. As a result, Saxon Math/SRA Reading have moved from being just ongoing assessments to acting also as the pre- and post-assessments. • Scope and sequence of Saxon Math & SRA Reading have correlations to Indiana academic standards. • Student goal sheets provided include no information about how programming is created based on the student's pre-assessment. Instead, the goal sheets provided simply ask the tutor to select standards areas that they would like to work on. The sheet then states, "we will denote these goals on each student's individual learning plan…after the initial assessments, we will create additional individualized goals for your student." A separate individual learning plan needs to be developed. The revised individual learning plan must include measurable student goals, specific standards that students will work on, and specific methods, lessons, and instructional techniques that will be used to help students attain the identified goals.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: RST Foundation
SITE: St. Monica & St. Luke Church, 645 Rhode Island Ave., Gary, IN;
Carrie Gosch Elementary School (School City of East Chicago)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 5

DATE: 01/28/08; 02/07/08
REVIEWERS: M.C., K.S., C.E.

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:30PM; 5:00PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			At one site, students worked in small groups with a variety of tutors. All students had workbooks. In the first group, the students worked independently on their workbooks and then had their work checked by the tutor. The tutor worked primarily with one student in the group, while the other students primarily worked independently without any tutor interaction. After a few minutes, the site director came over to the group and began reading with a group of four students. It was unclear why this happened. In another group, the students worked on worksheets. They primarily worked independently in the time observed. In the third group, again students were working on worksheets. In this group, the tutor did provide some instruction and attempted to rotate among students and help them understand concepts. However, the instruction provided was not always clear (see below) and students did not always grasp the meaning. In many cases, when students didn't understand, the tutor simply repeated the words more loudly. In another group, the tutor worked with students using manipulatives to practice positive and negative numbers. Although instruction was observed in a few groups, in many of the groups, the lessons seemed to be primarily workbook or worksheet based, and very little instruction was observed other than tutors correcting students' answers or reading the instructions for them. No project-based activities were observed. At another site, the tutor was finishing the lesson (due to errors on the tutoring schedule submitted, reviewers arrived while the lesson was wrapping up). The tutor provided lesson plans that included standards covered and instructional methods used, as well as

					instructional strategies used or suggested. The tutor explained that each student had a workbook packet and that lessons included small and large group instruction as well as independent work. Lessons at the first site did not appear to match the description in the provider's application. The application states that lessons will be small group instruction or one-to-one instruction and will be infused with project-based learning, and the sample lesson plans submitted in the amended application describe actual activities to be undertaken by students with tutor support, as well as discussions of concepts. However, what was observed at the site was mostly students working on workbook pages with very little tutor interaction and very little instruction. When instruction was provided, it did not appear to be organized around a lesson plan. No project-based activities were observed, and few instructional strategies or connections to larger concepts outside of just working on the workbook pages were observed. When the site director was asked for lesson plans, none were available as the site director informed the reviewers that lesson plans had been sent to the provider for review. As noted in IDOE Policies & Procedures, tutors should have lesson plans available for review on-site, while lessons are being observed. At the other site, although no lesson was actually observed due to errors on the schedule submitted by the provider, the tutor produced clear lesson plans that included activities, objectives, and standards to be covered, as well as instructional methods to be utilized to achieve objectives.
Instruction is clear		**X**			As noted above, little instruction was observed at the first site. Although tutors did sit with students and try to keep them on task, instruction observed was primarily to correct errors or to read the instructions to students. When actual instruction was provided, it was sometimes unclear to students how to connect what they were working on with broader math and language arts concepts. Tutors employed few instructional strategies to ensure that students gleaned meaning from the workbook pages they were completing. At the second site, although an actual lesson was not observed, it appeared that the tutor was organized and had specific lesson plans organized around state standards and specific lesson objectives. The students seemed very familiar with her classroom routines and were always clear on what was expected of them.
Time on task is appropriate		**X**			At the first site, especially in the groups with younger children, students sometimes struggled to stay on task as they worked independently on workbook pages. Younger students often got up to sharpen their pencils or walked around the room. Although tutors were often able to redirect students and get them back to working on their workbook pages, students sometimes seemed bored with the workbook activities and lack of tutor interaction. In a few groups, when the tutor would work individually with one student, the other students working independently would get off task and begin conversing with one another. The site director tried to help redirect students when they were off task and was helpful at keeping the noise level down. At the second site, the tutor had clearly established rules and routines for the tutoring group. All students were quiet and on task and followed instructions very well. The tutor was very good at ensuring that students remained on task.

Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			At one site, some tutors seemed to be confused as to what students were supposed to be working on or how lessons were supposed to be structured, because they primarily let students work independently on workbook pages with little interaction. Tutors did not appear to understand what "project-based instruction" is supposed to be. Tutors sometimes had trouble interacting with students on an even basis and ended up spending a lot of time with one student and then leaving other students to work independently for long periods of time with little tutor interaction. Few actual instructional strategies were observed. The site director explained that there was one new tutor at the site, as well as one substitute. However, even though one of the tutors was new, because RST's application explains that all tutors are provided two days of professional development training before they start, the new tutor should not have had any problems. Additionally, it is important that even if there is a tutor sub for the day, the sub understands clearly what the lesson plan is and how to implement that plan. As noted above, lesson plans were not available at the first site because they had been sent away. It is important that lesson plans are available for the lessons being implemented at each site. The tutor at the second site appeared very knowledgeable of her students' academic levels and was able to produce multiple lesson plans, including a lesson plan for that day's lesson. The tutor appeared to have a good knowledge of how to implement the lessons that she had planned.
Student/instructor ratio:_7:1; 6:1; 6:1; 4:1; 8:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X	■	Ratios met or were under the ratio described in the amended application. However, at the first site, it often appeared that ratios were too large for the type of work (independent, workbook-based lessons) being conducted, and tutors struggled to ensure equal time among all students in the groups.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: RST Foundation   **DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 02/26/08**
REVIEWER: MC

The following information is rated "Compliance" (C) or "Non-Compliance" (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	**ALL** of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	• Criminal background checks were submitted for all tutors • Some criminal background checks were not completed appropriately.		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	**ONE** of the following: -Student release policy(ies) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	• Student release policy • Evacuation policy • Emergency plan • Transportation policy & safety rules • Student program permission slip	X	
Financial viability	**ONE** of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	• Certificate of liability insurance • Current operations report	X	